

REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated September 9, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claim 7 was previously canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-15 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,374 to *Uejima et al.* (hereinafter “*Uejima*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” The Applicants respectfully submit that *Uejima* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-6 and 8-10. Thus, *Uejima* cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 recites a power supply comprising, among other features, “a DC power unit,” and a second power converter which supplies “said microcomputer with a regulated feedback” and “has at least two power taps.” *Uejima* does not disclose any of these features.

Nevertheless, the Office Action alleges in paragraph 3 that *Uejima* discloses “a DC power unit (figure 1, item 11),” “a second converter (figure 1, item 17),” “a feedback voltage in the standby mode (figure 1, item STANDBY SIGNAL),” and “at least two power taps (figure 1, item 5V and 12V).” The Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, the Applicants note that *Uejima* does not disclose a DC power unit as alleged in the Office Action. The element having the reference numeral 11 is not a DC power unit. It is a rectifier circuit.

Second, *Uejima* does not disclose a second power converter which supplies a microcomputer with a regulated feedback voltage. Assuming, *arguendo*, the standby signal cited by the Examiner is a feedback signal, the signal is not being supplied by a second power converter to a microcomputer as expressly required by the claim. This signal is actually supplied by controller 16 to controller 41. Controller 16 is not a second power converter. According to the Examiner, a regulator 17 is the second power converter. In fact, regulator 17 does not supply anything to a microcomputer. Thus, *Uejima* fails to disclose this feature of claim 1.

Third, as stated, claim 1 requires that the second power converter have two tapped outputs. While *Uejima* does disclose a 5V and 12V output, the regulator 17, which constitutes a second power converter according to the Examiner, does not include the 12V output. The 12V output is instead associated with DC-DC converter 15. In other words, the 12V output has nothing to do with regulator 17. Thus, regulator 17 does not have two tapped outputs.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, *Uejima* does not disclose all the elements recited in claim 1. As such, claim 1, as well as claims 2-6 and 8-10, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over *Uejima* and the Applicants therefore request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 9 recites a power supply comprising, among other features, “a feedback circuit connected between the tapped output and an input of the transformer.” *Uejima* does not disclose this feature. *Uejima* does not disclose a transformer having a tapped output. Thus, *Uejima* cannot disclose a feedback circuit connected between a tapped output and an input of the transformer, as recited in claim 9. The Applicants submit that claim 9 is allowable over the cited references for this additional reason and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,466 to *Hirahara* (hereinafter “*Hirahara*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Hirahara does not disclose all the features recited in claims 11-15. Thus, *Hirahara* cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 11 recites a power supply comprising, among other features, “a DC power unit” and a transformer having “at least two power taps” including “a tapped output that is fed back to an input of said transformer.” None of these features are disclosed in *Hirahara*.

Regardless, the Office Action alleges in paragraph 4 that *Hirahara* discloses “a DC power unit (figure 1, item 4),” “a first converter (figure 1, item 5),” “a second converter (figure 1, item 40)” along with “at least two power taps (figure 1, item 17 and 18).” The Office Action also alleges in paragraph 4 that *Hirahara* discloses “a feedback voltage in the standby mode (figure 1, item 32 and column 4, line 65-68).” The Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions.

First, regarding reference numeral 4 in FIG. 1 of *Hirahara*, this is not a DC power unit. Instead, *Hirahara* discloses that this element is in fact a main bridge rectifier 4 and not a DC power unit. Thus, it is a voltage rectifier.

Second, a regulator 40 does not have at least two power taps as required. Voltage terminals 17 and 18, which the Examiner asserts are outputs with regulator 40, in fact, have nothing to do with regulator 40. Rather, voltage terminals 17 and 18 are associated with a transformer 5. Furthermore, terminal 18 is actually an input to regulator 40, not an output. Thus, *Hirahara* does not disclose a transformer having “at least two power taps.”

Further, as may be seen in Figure 1, neither of the DC output voltage terminals 17 and 18 includes a tapped output. Since *Hirahara* does not disclose a power tap that includes a tapped output, it is impossible for *Hirahara* to disclose a tapped output that is fed back to an input of a transformer, as recited in claim 11.

Regarding the alleged feedback voltage in the standby mode, the Applicants submit that reference numeral 32 is not a feedback voltage, nor does it provide voltage input to a transformer. Instead, as is clearly shown in the Figure, this element is a phototransistor, and it is not an output that is fed back to an input of a transformer, as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, claim 11 is, as are claims 12-15 which depend therefrom, patentable over the cited reference and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant's representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant